

A. Natararani, A. Carnevali, C. Wang, D. Beamer, D. Vines, J. Chaudhuri, J. Garrison, J. Cleman,  
M. Abdullah, M. Runnels, R. Vogel, S. Keslacy, Y. Li

ABSENT

C. Rodriguez, O. Bernal, T. Bettcher

EXCUSED ABSENCE

Chair Avramchuk convened the meeting at 1:50 p.m.

Senator Raspopov read the Tongva land acknowledgement.

1. 1.1 Chair's announcements:

ANNOUNCEMENTS

1.1.1 First, I'd like to remind everybody of some housekeeping:

- Wish to speak as a Senator or yield the Floor to a guest?  
-Raise your hand and be recognized and address the Chair only
- Speaking without being recognized by the Chair?  
-Only when raising a "Point of Order" or "Point of Information"
- Questions about Senate **rules** on Academic Senate's website?  
- email Senate Chair or Parliamentarians: Kevin Baaske or Talia Bettcher
- Questions about **iCicker**?  
-Email Senate Secretary: Clare Larkins
- Other Questions about Senate business?  
-Email Chair or Senate Office

1.1.2 Today's meeting objectives/rules:

- Focus on POLICY, including debates on the second-reading items (please refer to specifics in the documents)
- Questions from the Floor agenda item: up to 20 minutes
- Senate Chair's report: up to 5 minutes

1.2 Senator Porter announced: We have a new restricted course number approved by EPC: 4995 [Undergraduate Research]

Each department can create an undergraduate research course in their discipline. The benefits include:

- CSU-wide reporting of undergraduate research activities will be more accurate.
- Undergraduate research will be recognized both at the campus/system level and as part of our students educational records.
- This course will also reflect our institution's commitment to undergraduate research.

1.3 Senator Castillo announced: The unions had their first Unity Wednesday of the school year this past Wednesday and we will have our next one on Wednesday, October 2. You're welcome to come and get to know more about the staff and faculty that work on campus and the unions that represent you.

I'd also like to say that the staff union opposed the systemwide Time, Place and Manner Policy that was implemented. We have a problem that the CSU policy regarding protests and activities on campus, which is a clear violation of HEERA, and the CSU has no right to take this unilateral step without first bargaining with the unions or represented employees. The CSUEU has issued a cease and desist and filed an unfair labor practice charges with the State Labor Board. As a union member, we have legal protections when engaging and union activities, such as tabling, meeting, picketing and strikes.

1.4 Andre Ellis, AVP of DEI announced: I just want to remind people that the HSI week event scheduled for today at 4:00pm has been moved from the U-SU Plaza to the LA Rooms because of air quality concerns. We will feature mariachi with our own Music Faculty, Cynthia Flores, and a lightning round session organized by our Title V DHSI team. A second event is on Thursday in the Library, and this will be our kickoff for Latinx Heritage Month. It's also the opening of the new book display exhibit on the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor and will take place from 3:00pm-4:00pm.

ANNOUNCEMENTS  
(continued)

- 1.5 Kipenzi Chidinma, faculty in Marketing, announced: I have a guest presenter Mike Willis, from Virgin Records coming to present on Wednesday, September 11, 6:30-7:30pm in the Annenberg Science Complex Room 132 and I would like to open it up to the campus community. He will be promoting hiring for intern positions, both locally and globally for Virgin Music Group. He's looking to hire 30-50 students under the guise of business behind the music – including marketing and A&R research. Please share with your students and they can register using the QR code or the link.

QUESTIONS FROM THE  
FLOOR

3. The following questions/concerns were raised from the floor:
- Is there a way to extend the discussion of a policy when it becomes a Second-Reading Item?
  - Can we have a moratorium about the Cal State LA addendum to the CSU Time, Place and Manner Policy?

Chair Avramchuk and VP Day responded from the floor.

INTENT TO RAISE  
QUESTIONS

4. 4.1 Senator Harris announced his intent to raise the following questions:  
The university administration has made appreciated efforts to improve communication about King Hall, and last summer's asbestos abatement work has been reassuring.  
However, the new super high-gloss paint coupled with new ultra-bright lights has rendered the newly renovated areas of King Hall medically inaccessible to members of the campus community (Similar new lighting across campus has also received complaints).  
Can someone from the administration, preferably facilities, explain how the university managed renovation bids, especially the selection process for the new paint and lighting King Hall?  
Was accessibility considered during the materials selection process?  
The California Department of Education's Code of Regulations, Title 5, Section 14030(l) follows:
1. Lighting. Light design shall generate an illumination level that provides comfortable and adequate visual conditions in each educational space, specifically:
    1. Ceilings and walls are white or light colored for high reflectance unless function of space dictates otherwise.
    2. Lights do not produce glare or block the line of sight.
    3. Window treatment allows entrance of daylight but does not cause excessive glare or heat gain.
    4. Fixtures provide an even light distribution throughout the learning area.
    5. Light design follows the California Electrical Code found in Part 3 of Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations.
- To what extent did the university ensure the renovated areas of King Hall adhere to those standards?  
To what extent does the renovated area adhere to the guidance in the Illuminating Engineering Society's Handbook?  
To what extent does the lighting, paint, and acoustics adhere to The American National Standards Institute's standard 12.60?

- 4.2 Senator Wells announced his intent to raise the following questions:  
Dear President Eanes,
- In the current budgetary climate, the college funding model on our campus needs to be reexamined with transparency and objectivity. However, while we have access to critical pieces of information such as annual budget allocations to each college, college annual enrollment targets, and expected student/faculty ratios for each college, the relationship between these elements is not transparent. Similarly, the methodologies used to create the assigned college enrollment targets and

student/faculty ratios, which profoundly impact college budgets, are neither obvious nor readily available. In the interest of the Senate Chair's time, the background information and data that form the basis of this IRQ are relegated to an Appendix that Senators may wish to reference for additional context. The Appendix was compiled by Kirsten Fisher, Chair of the Department of Biological Sciences.

### *Questions*

Presumably, both enrollment targets and SFRs (student-faculty ratios) are used by Academic Affairs leadership to calculate the base funding allocated to each college every year. Enrollment targets impact the amount of funding that the different colleges have available to spend on each student that they serve. For example, as a result of enrollment targets and SFRs, the level of 2023-2024 funding provided to each college varied from \$3624.93 per FTES for NSS to \$5,684.61 per FTEs for ECST. That means for every dollar in FTES funding to ECST, NSS received less than 61 cents, or 39.8% less. The other five degree-granting colleges fell somewhere between these two extremes. Enrollment targets and SFRs also dictate which colleges benefit from excess enrollment funding, and to what degree. In 2023-2024, the funding for each excess FTES varied from \$2,402.22 for NSS and the College of Ethnic Studies to \$3,603.33 for ECST. This means that for every dollar received by ECST for excess FTES, NSS and the College of Ethnic Studies received under 67 cents, or 33.3% less. Given that enrollment targets and SFRs profoundly influence student and instructor experiences in the classroom, yet vary so widely from college to college with no clear rationale provided for the discrepancy, please explain:

1. The formula that was originally used to calculate the target enrollments for each college, and why these targets have not been globally adjusted or reexamined for accuracy and feasibility, given at least 10 years of data on enrollment trends.
2. The formula, pedagogical criteria, and/or other variables that were used to create the SFR for each college.
3. What quantitative relationship, if any, the college enrollment targets and SFRs have with the colleges' annual base allocation of funding for faculty salary.

## APPENDIX – Data Compiled by Kirsten Fisher, Chair of the Department of Biological Sciences

### *Terminology & Background*

College **enrollment targets** are expressed in numbers of full-time equivalent students, or FTES (1 FTES = 15 units of undergraduate course enrollment). Likewise, faculty are expressed in terms of the yearly full-time equivalent faculty (FTEF) teaching workload (1 FTEF = 30 teaching units). In addition to an enrollment target, each college is assigned a target number of students each faculty member is expected to teach, which is referred to as the **student/faculty ratio**, or **SFR** ( $SFR = FTES/FTEF$ ).

The college enrollment targets and SFRs were developed by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness (formerly Institutional Research) and have not changed for at least ten years. The one exception to this long period of stasis came with establishment of the College of Ethnic Studies: When CoES was created, it was assigned an enrollment target and the College of Natural and Social Sciences enrollment target was reduced in parallel by this amount. Both colleges retained the original SFR assigned to NSS.

### *Disparity in Funding per FTES Across the Colleges*

Fiscal year allocations to each of the colleges since 2008 can be found under the Academic Affairs link on the university's [Annual Budget webpage](#). Overall, base funding for faculty salaries comprises the majority of each college's budget, and these allocations have remained consistent over the last 16 years, with annual adjustments limited to general salary increases and the hiring or retirement of tenure-line faculty within the colleges. Again, the only exception to this pattern came with the establishment of the College of Ethnic Studies and the creation of a new budget allocation for this college.

Significant disparity exists amongst the colleges when enrollment targets are considered in lieu of budget allocations for faculty salary (Table 1). For example, last year, the level of funding per FTES (based on college enrollment targets) ranged from \$5684.61 to \$ 3624.83, a difference of \$2,059.78 (Table 1).

Table 1. Budget for faculty salary allocated to each college over the past three years, target enrollments in the colleges during this period, and the resulting funding per target number of full-time equivalent students (FTES).

College	AY	Adjusted Faculty Salary Allocation	FTES Target	Faculty Funding per target FTES
A&L	2021-2022	\$14,996,539.00	3759	\$3,989.50
B&E		\$10,938,576.00	2315	\$4,725.09
CoE		\$6,536,266.00	1375	\$4,753.65
ECST		\$7,193,002.00	1389	\$5,178.55
HHS		\$12,738,221.00	3147	\$4,047.73
NSS		\$19,602,820.00	5924	\$3,309.05
CoES		\$1,895,809.00	591	\$3,207.80
A&L	2022-2023	\$15,270,300.00	3759	\$4,062.33
B&E		\$11,430,903.00	2315	\$4,937.76
CoE		\$6,591,634.00	1375	\$4,793.92
ECST		\$7,317,808.00	1389	\$5,268.40
HHS		\$12,801,327.00	3147	\$4,067.79
NSS		\$19,919,196.00	5924	\$3,362.46
CoES		\$1,995,493.00	591	\$3,376.47
A&L	2023-2024	\$16,369,365.00	3759	\$4,354.71
B&E		\$12,582,148.00	2315	\$5,435.05
CoE		\$7,128,469.00	1375	\$5,184.34
ECST		\$7,895,927.00	1389	\$5,684.61
HHS		\$14,335,754.00	3147	\$4,555.37
NSS		\$21,473,508.00	5924	\$3,624.83
CoES		\$2,325,974.00	591	\$3,935.66

*Excess Enrollment Funds*

At the end of each academic year, colleges that exceeded their enrollment target that year are rewarded with excess enrollment funds. The formula used to calculate a college’s excess enrollment funding is as follows: (FTES in excess of enrollment target) \* (\$64,860 / SFR)

Note: The Chancellor’s Office sets the unit amount used to calculate the replacement rate for one full-time faculty member, and in AY 2023-24 the total replacement cost per FTEF was \$64,860.

Student/faculty ratios vary greatly from college to college; thus the amount of funding returned per excess FTES also varies amongst the colleges (Table 2). This inequity is augmented by the fact that some colleges receive more base faculty funding per FTES and are expected to serve fewer FTES, positioning them to more feasibly achieve excess enrollments than colleges with higher enrollment targets that they must attempt to meet while receiving less base funding per FTES (Table 3).

Table 2. College student/faculty ratios (SFR) and funding per excess full-time equivalent student (FTES), calculated by dividing the FTEF replacement cost by the number of FTES per FTEF (the SFR) in each college.

College	SFR	Funding per each excess FTES (\$64,860/SFR)
NSS	27	\$2,402.22
CoES	27	\$2,402.22
B&E	26	\$2,494.62
HHS	23	\$2,820
A&L	22	\$2,948.18
CoE	19	\$3,413.68
ECST	18	\$3,603.33

Table 3. Target and actual FTES enrollments in each college for the past three years, and resulting excess enrollment funds = *Actual FTES* – *Target FTES* \* (*\$64,860/SFR*)

College	AY	FTES Target	FTES Actual	+/- FTES Target	Excess Enrollment Funding*
A&L	2021-2022	3759	4108	349	\$1,028,915.00
B&E		2315	2777	462	\$1,152,512.00
CoE		1375	1701	326	\$1,112,861.00
ECST		1389	1560	171	\$616,170.00
HHS		3147	4577	1430	\$4,032,600.00
NSS		5924	5988	64	\$153,742.00
CoES		591	1026	435	\$1,044,967.00
A&L	2022-2023	3759	3993	234	\$689,875.00
B&E		2315	2683	368	\$918,018.00
CoE		1375	1607	232	\$791,975.00
ECST		1389	1558	169	\$608,963.00
HHS		3147	4312	1165	\$3,285,300.00
NSS		5924	5701	-223	\$0.00
CoES		591	1072	481	\$1,155,469.00
A&L	2023-2024	3759	3794	35	\$103,186.00
B&E		2315	2758	443	\$1,080,168.00
CoE		1375	1584	209	\$713,460.00
ECST		1389	1625	236	\$850,387.00
HHS		3147	4277	1130	\$3,186,600.00
NSS		5924	5567	-357	\$0.00
CoES		591	1183	592	\$1,422,116.00

\*based on 23-24 FTEF replacement rate (\$64,860)

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

4. It was m/s/p (Oropeza Fujimoto) to approve the minutes of the meeting of August 27, 2024 (ASM 24-2).

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

5. 5.1 It was m/s/ (Meyerott) to approve the agenda.
- 5.2 It was m/s/ (Oropeza Fujimoto) to add “Discussion of Time, Place and Manner Policy” as a new item 7.
- 5.3 It was m/s/ (Porter) to amend the Oropeza Fujimoto motion to add it to the agenda of the next Senate meeting. An objection was raised.
- 5.4 Debate ensued. No objections to the Porter amendment.
- 5.5 The Oropeza Fujimoto as amended passed.
- 5.6 It was m/s/ (Harris) to switch items 9 and 10. No objections were raised.
- 5.7 The agenda was approved as amended.

SENATE CHAIR’S REPORT

6. Chair Avramchuk presented his report.

PROPOSED POLICY MODIFICATION: DEFINITION, PHILOSOPHY, STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES AND CRITERIA FOR GENERAL EDUCATION REQUIREMENTS, FACULTY HANDBOOK, CHAPTER IV (24-1) (changed to doc 24-1.1) *Second-Reading Item*

7. 7.1 It was m/s/ (Harris) to introduce a substitute motion to replace the proposed policy modification with a new document drafted by the Educational Policy Committee.
- 7.2 Debate ensued.
- 7.3 The Harris motion passed. (V: 32/2/7)
- 7.4 It was m/s/ (Ford Baxter) in line 544 to insert BEGIN DEVELOPING INFORMATION LITERACY COMPETENCIES AND after “will”.
- 7.5 It was m/s/ (Porter) to amend the Ford Baxter motion to read DEMONSTRATE BEGINNING INFORMATION LITERACY COMPETENCY. No objections were raised.
- 7.6 Debate ensued.

ADJOURNMENT

8. It was m/s/p (Porter) to continue item 7 as a Second-Reading Item and adjourn at 3:47 p.m.